

ADDRESS

by

LIEUTENANT GENERAL VERNON A. WALTERS

before

FORT LAUDERDALE COUNCIL

NAVY LEAGUE OF THE UNITED STATES

Fort Lauderdale, Florida

16 June 1976

(DEFINITE RECORD IN DDCI/WALTERS)

Thank you very much. I am very happy to have this occasion to talk to this Navy League Council, in the presence of so many distinguished guests, including representatives of the Royal Navy, who are here tonight.

I thought I would talk to you, but before I talk to you I must say that I speak with a certain sadness as I learned shortly before I came here that our Ambassador to Beirut, Lebanon, Francis Meloy, was kidnapped and murdered along with his economic counselor and his Lebanese driver this afternoon. It makes you wonder what kind of a world we live in. From the middle ages, the person of an ambassador has always been sacred. This is the second ambassador we have lost in just a few years. I think it is eloquent of the kind of a world in which we live and the anarchy and the winds of folly that are blowing around the world today that make all men who are concerned with the survival of freedom and with some kind of a system of international peace and justice concerned with what is going on.

I am going to talk to you tonight about what I truly believe to be the oldest profession in the world. There are others who believe that another profession, which has been receiving considerable attention in the press recently, is the oldest profession. But I would remind you that before this other profession could operate someone had to

know where it was. That was intelligence, which is therefore the oldest profession in the world.

The United States has always had a very ambivalent view of intelligence. We liked it but we don't like to admit that we did it. We sort of think it was all right for all those old British, French, Russians, and Germans to do it, but we fine, moral, upstanding Americans don't do that sort of thing. Well we have, fortunately, otherwise we would not be a free and independent nation today. We have always built up our intelligence during the conflicts in which we have participated and then we destroy it. A little while ago in my biography, you heard that I went to the Army Military Intelligence Training Center at Camp Ritchie in 1942. Do you know who was running it? A British colonel. That was the state of American intelligence in August 1942. We didn't have anybody qualified to run it.

In the invocation Nathan Hale was mentioned. I must make a confession. The chaplain that made the invocation has departed so I can tell this story safely. Out at the CIA we have a statue of Nathan Hale. It was put up over my bitter protest. Not that he wasn't a very brave young man, he did utter a very immortal line that he regretted that he had only one life to give for his country. The problem with Nathan Hale was that he was a spy who was caught on his first mis-

sion and he had all the evidence on him. I am not sure that this is what we want to hold up to our young career trainees as an example. He was sent by Washington into Manhattan to find out when the British were going to land. They met him. They were already there. But we have always had this view and we have engaged in a sort of striptease of our intelligence that has stupefied our foreign friends. They have had problems with their intelligence services and when they do, they set up a discreet commission of inquiry which inquires, reports to the parliamentary body or to the responsible parties, and they sanction people who have done wrong, and they take corrective measures to prevent certain abuses.

I must tell you that not long ago a Congressman asked me how you could abolish abuses in intelligence, and I said that I had only one suggestion. That was to stop using human beings, because as long as you use human beings certain things are going to happen that you would prefer not to happen.

Why do we need this intelligence? We need this intelligence because we live in a very unsafe world. Less than 20 percent of mankind lives today in what we would call freedom. The others live in various forms of repression and tyranny. We in America face the situation we have not faced since our Revolution. For the first time we face a potential adversary who is a global power. Germany at the height

of its power was basically a continental European power, with no capability to harm the United States other than by submarines sinking some ships off our coasts. The Soviet Union is a global power. The Soviet Union is able and willing, as Angola shows, to project its powers 10,000 miles from the Soviet Union. We see the Soviet Union deploying five, perhaps six, new types of long-range, intercontinental ballistic missiles, all of them heavier and more accurate than the generation they replaced. We see the Soviet Union building very large numbers of submarines, equipping them with missiles which they can fire at the United States, not from mid-Atlantic, but right from their home port waters. We see a Soviet Navy that in a few years has gone from a coast guard-type Navy to a blue-water navy. We see the Soviets developing aircraft with capabilities against the United States, as well as against our European and Asiatic allies. We see the Soviet Union upgrading all of its conventional forces and spending considerably more money on defense than we do out of a gross national product less than half as big as ours. We see burgeoning of the same thing in China.

I feel that we in the Intelligence Community owe the American people the answers to four overriding questions: Who will be in control of the Soviet Union five years from

today? What will be their attitude toward us and toward our allies? What is there in Soviet research and development today that will impact on our lives tomorrow? And the same questions for China, a little further down the line. So this is the kind of a world in which we live. And the real issue before the American people is: do they want to have effective intelligence or do they want to wait until the day when we have to choose between abject humiliation and nuclear blackmail.

It is to many of our foreign friends a stupefying thing that someone in my position would be out talking to the general public. They come into my office with a slightly glassy stare after they have seen the road sign outside the building which says CIA. One of them said to me, "I don't believe it, it isn't possible, you're not pointing an arrow at your secret intelligence service." In most other countries, no one knows who's in them or even if they exist." It reminds me of a story that was told to me not long ago by the head of a foreign service. He said, "The Soviets recruited a spy in Naples, and they took him to Moscow and trained him in secret writing, shortwave communications, codes and everything else. Then they sent Agnello back to Naples and said, "Now you wait there, we'll be in touch with you in a couple of years." So, in a couple of years somebody came out from Moscow, went to

the address, looked at the names on the door, and he saw Agnello, ground floor right. He went in and pushed the button. The man opened the door and said, "Agnello, I have come from Moscow." The man looked at him and he said, "Signore, there is a big mistake. I am Agnello the tailor, Agnello the spy is on the third floor left." And the head of this foreign service said, "Sometimes I suspect that Agnello was really an American."

Be that as it may, we have come through this lengthy investigation. You have heard all about the allegations that were made. Let me talk to you about these allegations for a minute. I cannot tell you that there were not things done that should not have been done. I cannot tell you that there were not abuses. I cannot tell you that there were not kooks. I cannot tell you that there was not bad judgment. But I would like to put this a little bit into perspective. Everybody has talked about assassination. What was the ultimate finding of all of these investigations? Nobody was assassinated. Yes, a lot of people talked about it. Well, a lot of people talked about a lot of things. But nobody was assassinated. You all saw the picture of the dart gun which a Senator held up very cheerily. The dart gun was never used. That, of course, was played in the low key.

Then we get to those various allegations of what was going on. First, you heard about the massive wire taps which

gave you the impression that for the last thirty years everybody in the United States has had his phone conversations listened to by the CIA. What are the facts? The facts are that the Director of Central Intelligence is the only person in the United States who is charged by law with the protection of his sources and methods. These wire taps were against people from CIA who were suspected of taking things home or of communicating with foreign agents. How many were there? There were 32 wire taps in 27 years. That is one and a quarter wire taps a year. But the impression conveyed to the American people was that "big brother" was listening to everything they were saying.

Then we got the break-ins. All of the break-ins were against CIA employees who were suspected of taking documents home with them.

Then you heard about the drug experiments. Well, we saw a man like Cardinal Mindszenty, who had resisted every pressure the Nazis could bring to bear on him. Suddenly the communists brought him before the newsreel cameras, hollow-eyed, to confess every crime in the book. Those of us who were old enough to remember believed it was done with mind-bending drugs. We believed those drugs might be used against us, and we had to find out how to defend ourselves against it. And it was not just the armed forces and the CIA that

were engaged in such research. The National Institutes of Health and a great many very respectable, very liberal universities were doing exactly the same thing.

Then you had these toxins, so-called drugs. Well, the Russians used those to kill some people in Germany in the 50's. We were afraid they would be used on us, and, yes, we experimented to find out how they worked so that we could defend ourselves and, if need be, retaliate. You know the United States committed itself not to use poison gas before World War II. That did not prevent the United States from making many millions of poison gas shells to be used in retaliation in case they were used against us. Most of you who have been in the service know that every command and every country has contingency plans. A contingency plan does not mean that you intend to do it; it means that you have a plan for a certain set of circumstances.

These allegations have been used to try and demonstrate to the American people that the real threats to the freedom of the American people come from the CIA and the FBI. The CIA has never had the power to arrest anybody. How you are supposed to be a gestapo when you can't arrest anybody, I don't know. These facts are carefully, of course, not mentioned.

If we go back 2,500 years, we find a Chinese author, a man by the name of Sun Tzu, who wrote a book called The Art of War. He describes how to undo your enemies. Remember, this book is 25 centuries old. Let me just quote to you some of the things he said. The first general consideration was: "Fighting is the most primitive and crude form of making war on your enemies." And then he goes on to describe how to take them apart without fighting. "Cover with ridicule everything that is valid in your opponent's country. Denounce their leaders, involve them in criminal enterprises and at the right time turn them over to the scorn of their fellow countrymen. Aggravate by every means at your command all existing differences within your opponent's country. Agitate the young against the old." There are 13 of these and he concludes by saying, "The greatest excellence is not to win a hundred victories in a hundred battles; the greatest excellence is to subdue your enemies without ever having to fight them."

I think not enough of us are prepared for what I believe are the new forms of war, which is the combination of the threat of the use of war with all kinds of activity to make us wonder about the justice of our own cause. It has been repeatedly proved that it is difficult to stop the United States from the outside. If you want to stop it, you have to stop it from the inside.

You know someone told me a story the other day that I thought was very good. It was about three sailors who were shipwrecked on an island in the Pacific. One was French, one was British, and one was American. They were immediately captured by cannibals. And the chief of the cannibals said to them, "I have some bad news and good news for you." The bad news is that we're going to have you for lunch tomorrow, and I don't mean as guests. The good news, and you need some good news after that bad news, is that I'll give you anything you want in the meantime." So, he turned to the Frenchman and he said, "What do you want?" The Frenchman said, "Well, if I am going to be killed in the morning I would just as soon spend the remaining hours with that beautiful cannibal girl over there." So they said, "Fine." They untied the Frenchman and he and the cannibal girl went off into the woods. Then they turned to the Englishman and they said, "What do you want?" The Englishman said, "I want a pen and paper." They said, "What do you want a pen and paper for?" He said, "I want to write a letter to the Secretary General of the United Nations to protest against the unjust, unfriendly, and unsporting attitude you have adopted toward us." So they said, "Okay," and they took the Englishman to a hut and they untied him and gave him a pen and paper, and he sat down and started

his "Dear Mr. Waldheim" letter. Then they turned to the American and they said, "What do you want?" The American said, "I want to be led into the middle of the village, I want to be made to kneel down, and I want the biggest cannibal here to kick me in the rear end," and the chief turned to his vice-chief and he said, "Those Americans are a weird bunch; you never know what they will ask for. But since I promised, we've got to do it." So, they untied the American, they led him into the middle of the village, they made him kneel down, and the biggest cannibal took a running leap, kicked the American in the rear end, and knocked him 15 feet. As the American sprawled out, he pulled out a tommy gun he had been hiding under his clothes, and he cut down the nearby cannibals, and the rest fled. Well, hearing the gunfire, the Frenchman came out of the woods and the Englishman came out of his hut, and they looked at the American standing there with a smoking tommy gun in his hand, and they said, "My God, do you mean to say that you had that gun the whole time?" The American said, "Sure." And they said, "Why didn't you use it before now?" And the foreigner who told me the story said, "The American looked at them with a hurt expression, and he said, 'But you don't understand, it wasn't until they kicked me in the rear end that I had any moral justification for such extreme action'."

Now, we have been lucky from time to time to get this kind of conveniently served up kick in the rear end. At Pearl Harbor we got it. We were able to recover from Pearl Harbor because the oceans were wide, there were other powers standing between us and our enemies, and we had the enormous advantage of the industrial power of the United States. I would like to know whether we could recover from a nuclear Pearl Harbor. The very existence of the Agency to which I belong was caused by the investigation into Pearl Harbor which proved, after the war, that a great many people in the United States Government had little pieces of information, which if they could have all been brought together into one central place, maybe wouldn't have avoided Pearl Harbor but would have made it a great deal less harmful to us than it was. And thus it was decided to create a central repository for this information.

Now there exists a widespread belief that the CIA is sitting on one little private pile of information and the Defense Intelligence Agency, the ONI and the Army G-2 on others. We are all working from the same data bank. We are all working from the same facts. No, we don't always agree. A military man always tends to view what the enemy's capabilities are. Non-military people sometimes put more emphasis on what his intentions are. The answer is that you need both.

We get a great deal of intelligence openly, through open publications, through open broadcasts, through our embassies, through public sources of all kinds, maybe even half, or more than half, but it is the easiest half. Then you get a considerable percentage through the great technical systems that have been developed in the last few years. But none of those will get you inside a man's head. None of those will tell you what people are thinking about. Only people can do that. And, you know, with that same ambivalence I was talking about the Congress created the CIA to engage in spying, to use the currently fashionable opprobrious word, it was called collecting intelligence previously. But they didn't say that. They said you will do such other things as the National Security Council may require.

Not long ago at the height of the discussion about assassination we had some Congressmen out at CIA and there was discussion of this question. Somebody said, "Well, of course, if anybody could have gotten Hitler in '43 or '44, he would undoubtedly have been the first joint recipient of the Congressional Medal of Honor and the Victoria Cross." And one of the young Congressmen said, "Yes, but think if you could have gotten him in '35 or '36 of how many lives you would have saved." I said, "Congressman, do I understand you are advocating assassination in peacetime?" He

said, "Oh no, but that was different." It's different because we know what happened subsequently.

One of the great German intelligence agents, Otto Skorzeny, was tried by the Allies after the war and he was accused of sending people in British and American uniforms behind the British and American lines during the war, a dastardly crime. Two British colonels and one American colonel who had done the same thing with people in German uniform testified on his behalf and the case was thrown out of court, even in the immediate post-war atmosphere of 1947. Moses sent spies into the land of Canaan. As I said, it is the oldest profession. But we need it today more than we've ever needed it before.

America in the past has always been unreachable and therefore unbeatable. That is unfortunately no longer true. In the years following World War II we solved problems in one of two ways. We solved them either by military force or we solved them by overwhelming them with our great financial and economic resources. We can't do that anymore. We need judgment, we need understanding, we need the ability to establish a foreign policy on a sound basis.

We do have a very large intelligence community, but what does it cost the American people? I am not at liberty to give you the figures, although the budgetary process for the American intelligence organizations is the same as for the Department of Agriculture or the

Department of Commerce, within the Congress, within the appropriations committees, within the Office of Management and Budget. It is simply not made public. We have not gotten that far into the Agnello business. People say, "Why can't you make it public?" Well, if you made it public for one year, nothing would happen. But if you made it public over a series of years, you would have bulges in it of major programs like the U-2 or the raising of the Soviet submarine, and you would start an unraveling process because people would ask why there were differences.

There is no other country in the world that discusses its intelligence services as openly as we do. In fact, in most countries they don't comment on it nor do they discuss it. In our system we have decided to do so.

A foreigner said to me once, "You Americans are the first people to have gone to the moon. You may well be the first people to run your intelligence service in Macy's window." Whether this is possible or not over a long period of time, I do not know. I personally do not believe it is.

I believe we can live with any form of oversight the Congress chooses, but I would devoutly hope that they would choose something like the Atomic Energy Committee where you have a Joint Committee of both Houses and which has been a model of discretion and responsibility.

Right now we are reporting to seven different committees which compose more than half the membership of both houses of Congress. How you can keep anything secret in that atmosphere I don't know.

John Jay, who ran the spies before the Revolution, was once called before the Committee of Secret Correspondence in the Congress and asked to lay before the Congress the names of his spies and how much he was paying them. John Jay's answer was, "Experience has shown that the Congress is composed of too many people to have this kind of disclosure made to the whole body. Such disclosures in the past have been fatal not merely to the project but to a great many of the people concerned." And he got away with it. Now as I say we've had this problem since the dawn of our history.

Not long ago not far from here I was having lunch with a former British Prime Minister, Lord Avon, Anthony Eden, and he was discussing the difficulties an ancestor of his had during the Revolution. Robert Eden was the Royal Governor of Maryland. He was in trouble with the British Government who thought he was overly sympathetic with the Americans and he was in trouble with the Americans who thought he wasn't sufficiently sympathetic with them. So I said to Lord Avon, "Yes, that may be true, but in the meantime his brother William in Paris had successfully

penetrated Benjamin Franklin's office." "Oh," he said, "You know about that, do you?"

When the French told Benjamin Franklin that France was entering the war against Great Britain in 1779, that information was in the hands of the British Government 42 hours later. And in those days if you rode a horse from Paris to the coast, took a boat across the Channel and rode from the Channel coast to London, it would take you about 42 hours.

You wouldn't believe some of the things the founding fathers did in the past. I've looked into it in the year of this 200th Anniversary of our Revolution, and some of our do-gooders would have been very upset with some of these people. Let me tell you about Benjamin Franklin, for instance. Benjamin Franklin for three years before the Revolution, when we were all loyal subjects of George III, was the Assistant Postmaster of British North America. Do you know what he was doing? He was opening that mail like crazy. The British caught him, they took him to London, they tried him before the Privy Council, and they found him guilty. But before they could sentence him, he skipped off to Paris. When he got to Paris, he designed and had the French build him a printing press. Do you know what he printed on the printing press? He printed some British passports and some British currencies, but mostly he

printed fabricated atrocity stories for insertion in the British press.

Now George Washington who understood the value of secrecy once wrote a letter to his Chief of Intelligence in New Jersey, Colonel Elias Dayton, and this is what he said: "The necessity of procuring good Intelligence is apparent and need not be further urged-- all that remains for me to add, is, that you keep the whole matter as secret as possible. For upon Secrecy, Success depends in most Enterprizes of the kind, and for want of it, they are generally defeated, however well planned and promising a favourable issue. I am, Sir, your obedient servant, George Washington."

One day in Connecticut, George Washington was spending the night at the home of some friends, sympathizers of the American Revolution, Mr. and Mrs. Holcomb, and in the morning he thanked the Holcombs and climbed up on his horse to ride on. Mrs. Holcomb came out to see him off and she said, "General, pray where do you ride tonight?" General Washington leaned down in the saddle and he said, "Madame, can you keep a secret?" She said, "Of course." He replied, "So can I, Madame," tipped his hat and rode on.

The idea that the founding fathers were dying to tell everybody everything is just historically inaccurate.

They weren't. Thomas Jefferson once got a group of men together and promised them five thousand pounds if they would go behind the British lines and kidnap Benedict Arnold. He said, "Don't go there and try to fight your way in. That will get you in trouble." He said, "Win his confidence and when you have worked your way in and won his confidence, bring him to me so that this greatest of traitors may receive the fate he so richly deserves."

You hear all about the opposition to our helping our friends abroad--so-called covert action, dirty tricks, or however they want to phrase it. I would just like a few Americans to reflect on how they think we got Texas or California or Hawaii. Americans should be the last people to denounce covert action since the French had 17,000 men in North America before France declared war on Great Britain during the Revolution. The Navy knows all about the battle between the Bonhomme Richard and the Serapis. What was the Bonhomme Richard? The Bonhomme Richard was a French ship that was slipped under the table to John Paul Jones, loaded with gunpowder and cannon, in complete violation of the state of neutrality with which France found itself with Great Britain at that time.

So they are trying to tell the American people that something terrible happened that had never happened before. Yes, there have been abuses. Yes, there have been wrong

things done. But if you put that up against the fact that we have provided our leaders with what I believe is as good information as has been placed before any government at any time in history. It isn't perfect. There are a lot of things that go wrong. President Kennedy once told us, "You are doomed to be pilloried for your failures and to have your successes passed over in silence."

What has the impact of all this been on us? I would like to be able to tell you that all of this has caused our foreign friends to shy away from us and have nothing to do with us. That is not true. They are steadfast and good friends and they have not done that. They have understood that this is a difficult time with us. We have assured them that we would not give away secrets which were not American secrets which had been entrusted to us by friendly foreign governments.

We have today four times as many young people applying to work in the Central Intelligence Agency as at any time in its history. We have a very small rate of people leaving. Yes, we have lost some people. Yes, we have lost some sources. But nothing like you would imagine from the hullabaloo that was created here. Of course, I must say, the volume was louder here than anywhere else. Most foreigners were somewhat puzzled by this and wondered what these tribal penitential cyclic

American rites are where we beat ourselves in the bosom at regular intervals every 20 or 25 years.

Not long ago the Prime Minister of an Asiatic country said to me, "How can I be on your side. Your country is in complete disarray. Your President and your Congress are squabbling like cats. You are making a striptease of your intelligence service. How can I be on your side?" I said, "Prime Minister, I am astounded that an intelligent man like you could possibly fall into the same errors as Adolph Hitler and William II in taking seriously the cyclic penitential American tribal rites. You must not be deceived by these." I was a young corporal in the American Army in the summer of 1941. The Germans had occupied all of Western Europe. They were moving towards Moscow at 15 miles a day and the United States Congress voted universal military service by a majority of one vote. How do you think the Japanese read that message? The existence of an effective intelligence capability on the part of the United States and its allies is one of the greatest deterrents against anyone attempting any Pearl Harbor again. In the early '60s in this country, we had a great debate about a missile gap, whether there was a missile gap or not. That would be impossible today. We know what they have and they know that we know what they have.

In the past intelligence has always been thought of as part of making war on somebody. It is also a force for peace. No one could sign an arms limitation agreement if he didn't have the means of verifying whether it was being lived up to or not. And we have that means of verifying. I think we have come through a very considerable storm. I think we have come through it in remarkably good shape. As far as I can tell you about the people in the American intelligence community, in CIA, in the Defense Intelligence, in Service Intelligence, they are of good heart. They know what they are doing is essential if we are to survive and they know that if there is one thing that you cannot have at this time in this century, it is to have your nation cruelly and strategically surprised. If you look around at the situation in which we and our allies find ourselves, we cannot fail. If we do, who will pick up the torch of human freedom. Thank you very much.

globe 1 22^{mp}

ADDRESS
by
LIEUTENANT GENERAL VERNON A. WALTERS
before
POMPANO BEACH COUNCIL
NAVY LEAGUE OF THE UNITED STATES

Lighthouse Point, Florida

17 June 1976

Mr. President, Gentlemen, I am very happy to have this occasion to address this Council of the Navy League. I never cease to marvel at how much the Navy League has done to keep alive the flame of love of country and what it means to us during some very difficult times through which we have just come and from which, I believe, we are now emerging. In our country everything is run by public opinion and unless you have public opinion behind you, there is very little you can do. Therefore, I think you have a tremendous role to play in making the American people aware of how important it is for us to have the armed forces that our country needs to maintain our freedom and to join with our allies in maintaining freedom all over the world.

I am particularly pleased to be here tonight and to see present officers of the United States Navy and the Royal Navy. As you know, we and our British cousins had a misunderstanding two centuries ago, a very serious misunderstanding, but since then in nearly all of the wars in which both our countries have been involved for the cause of human freedom, we and they have had disagreements, but in the important things we have found ourselves together. I would just like to tell you how happy I am to see them here. They are a very remarkable people, and don't ever underestimate them. They always talk in underestimation about themselves, but if you agree with them, you will be wrong.

I have an 86-year-old British aunt. When I arrived in England during the war, I was 22 years old and I asked, "Where is Aunt Ethel?" The answer was, "Aunt Ethel is in the Royal Air Force." I said, "Don't be ridiculous; she is an old woman; she must be 50." Aunt Ethel was the Regimental Sergeant Major of the Women's Royal Air Force Depot at Harrogate. About four months ago I was in London having lunch with Aunt Ethel and we were at a rather fashionable restaurant, Quaglino's, and the headwaiter came up and with typical British understatement, he said, "I'm dreadfully sorry, Sir, but there is a bomb scare." And I said, "Really, where?" He said, "Here, Sir." I said, "Here! You mean we should leave?" He said, "Everyone else has." So I looked around and everyone else had gone. I turned to my 86-year-old aunt and I said, "Aunt Ethel, there is a bomb scare." She said, "Really, are they after you?" I said, "I don't think so. I made the reservation under somebody else's name." "Well," she said, "that may be, but I have not finished my fish." I said, "Aunt Ethel, I don't think you heard what I said. I said there is a bomb scare." She said, "My dear boy, you must understand that I have been bombed many times in my life and at my age these things simply do not have the urgency that they do at yours, and I have not finished my fish." At this point, the manager of the hotel in which the restaurant is located came and in a very urgent voice, he said, "Sir, we've had a phone call. Will you please leave at once and take this lady with you." So I took my

aunt firmly by the hand and I said, "Aunt, we are leaving." She said, "In that case my wine goes with me even if my fish doesn't."

I want to talk to you a little bit about intelligence and how it is run because there are many misconceptions about this. Someone made reference a little while ago about the fact that I speak many languages. This is sometimes rewarding and sometimes dangerous. When I first came into the Army as a Private, the Master Sergeant who was interviewing me was very taken by the fact that I spoke a large number of languages. This was a period in our history when we were making the President of General Motors a Lieutenant General in the Transportation Corps and the head of RCA a Brigadier General in the Signal Corps, so I thought, "They'll probably make me a Lieutenant Colonel in Intelligence, but if they offer me a Majority, I'll take it since we'll all soon be in the war and have to make sacrifices." So we went on down the line and everybody was comparing MOS's, and I said, "What are MOS's?" And they said, "That's your Military Occupational Specialty. That's what you are going to do in the Army." I looked at my card and I saw where it had MOS 0506. I thought the time had come to use some of this leadership that I was going to be called upon for so soon, so I turned to one of the other guys and said, "Go find out what 0506 is." It worked like magic. He practically saluted and went off and came back with a slightly dazed look on his

face. He said, "0506 is a truck driver." I said, "Oh, somebody's made a mistake." No one had and guess who drove a truck for quite a while.

But one day, even in an army without computers, they plucked me out of this and sent me off to the Army's Military Intelligence Training Center at Camp Ritchie, Maryland. We Americans have always had a very curious view of Intelligence -- that it wasn't really American or that there was something dirty about it and so forth -- and we really haven't done much about it between the wars until recent years. When I got to that Camp, there was an American Colonel who was nominally the Commandant, but it was really being run by a British Colonel. That was the state of American intelligence one year after we were in the war.

We have always had good intelligence. We have always dismantled it between the wars. The wreckers have gotten to us and convinced us that it was immoral or wrong and so forth and we have undone it. Well, that is not true. All of our leaders throughout our history have used it and they have used it very successfully. We need it more today than at any other time in the past because we face a greater threat than we have ever faced in the whole of our national history. This is the first time in our history that someone has had the capability of damaging the United States seriously or even mortally, of inflicting great

damage on us internally. Therefore we have more need to know what is going on in the world than we have ever had before.

In the world as we used to know it, there was time, there was space, there were other powers between us and potential aggressors, and various other circumstances that we do not enjoy to the same degree. The world has shrunk. Today the world in which we live is actually far smaller, even if you take account of the ships crossing the ocean and everything else, than it was just a few years ago. So we must know what is going on about us, what threats there are against us. The lead time of modern equipment is such that if you just find out that somebody has got some development, it is going to take you two, three, four or five years to develop some counter to it. Now, in the old days you were able to do these things much more quickly, but not totally. When the Germans produced the magnetic mine, some answer was found very quickly for that, but many of these answers come in an indirect way from the need for intelligence.

Radar, one of the greatest developments of our time, which was so instrumental in the British victory at Matapan, was initially developed as a means of reconnaissance or intelligence to keep track of other people's ships and airplanes. In fact, the first airplane ever tracked by British radar before World War II was Neville Chamberlain's

airplane returning from Munich. They had only one year between then and the outbreak of war. You do not want to be caught by surprise because to take effective countermeasures takes longer than that today.

As I said last night in another talk which some of you may have heard, I am convinced that intelligence is the oldest profession. There are other professions, one specifically, which is alleged to be older, but I always claim that before that other one could operate, people had to know where it was. Therefore, intelligence is the oldest profession in the world. In fact, you will recall spies were sent into the land of Canaan thousands of years ago. Nobody who wants to conduct an organized society can do it without knowing what the potential threats to that society are. We face today potential threats from countries that are larger than we are, that have more people, and that have a kind of government which is willing to turn a far larger percentage of the gross national product into military expenditures.

We look at the Soviet Union today and we see a country which is spending more money on defense than we are and is spending it out of a gross national product less than half as large as ours. One cannot help wondering, when they are imposing this kind of sacrifice on their people, why this is being done. As we look around the world today, we see the Soviet Union deploying five new systems of intercontinental ballistic missiles, each more modern, more accurate, and capable of carrying a heavier warhead than the system it is

replacing. We see the Soviet Union building other formidable missiles and putting missiles aboard their submarines which can reach the United States from their home port waters. We see the Soviet Union's navy going from a coast-guard-type navy to a blue-water navy able to present Soviet power all over the world. We have seen the Soviets developing their air force, developing aircraft with a capability against the United States. We see them building larger and more powerful submarines than any they have built up to now with more tubes for launching missiles than the ones they have had up to now. We see them updating their ground forces. We see them filling them in with the logistical and support units they did not used to have. We see the tremendous sacrifices they are imposing on their people to do this. What their intentions are is something else, but the fact is they have the most formidable collection of power that has been arrayed against the United States and its allies in the whole of history. No nation, not even Germany, has maintained armed forces of this size in being in peacetime. There is the ever-present question before us of what do they intend to do with it? We see a tremendous scientific and research effort going on. We see them pushing this almost exclusively in the military area. Soviet research and development in other areas is a definitely much lower keyed thing than research and development in the military area. Many visitors to Russia are

startled because in the best hotels the window panes are of such poor quality glass that they distort the picture on the outside. But let me assure you the Soviets are quite capable of making a plexiglass nose for a bomber that does not distort because this is the area where they are concentrating the productive genius of a very great people. We see Mr. Breznev who tells us, yes, he is for détente, but at the same time making this tremendous military effort right across the board.

There is a great détente story I heard the other day that I think is very appropriate. First of all, there is a Russian proverb I would like to mention. The Russians love proverbs, and some of the greatest ammunition you can have when talking to a Russian is to have a Russian proverb that you can throw at him at the right time. They have some great proverbs and one of them is: "When you make friends with a bear, do not let go of your ax." That is not we saying it. They are saying it.

The détente story was of two young Americans who went to Moscow and were being taken around by a young Russian. He took them to the Kremlin and the Novodevichye Monastery and the Lenin University and the Lumumba University and then finally to the zoo where they saw a whole number of unusual animals . They went along the cages and they finally came to this great big cage where there was a huge Russian bear, eight feet tall weighing five hundred pounds, and in the

same cage was a small white lamb. The Americans were puzzled as to why the Russians would put the two of them in the same cage. They turned to the young Russian and they said, "Why do you put these two animals in the same cage?" "Oh," he said, "This is to prove that peaceful coexistence is possible." One of the young Americans said, "Well, I must say it is pretty impressive." The other said, "Yes, it sure is convincing." The young Russian looked around and seeing no one, bent over and said, "Of course, you understand, every morning we have to put in a new lamb, but as long as you don't run out of lambs there is no problem."

Obviously, all of us hope that we can work out some way of peaceful coexistence with the Russians but this has got to be a two-way street. No agreement in which one side derives all the advantages can last. You've got to have it working to the advantage of both sides. Both sides have got to have the feeling they are getting something out of it. We do have one great advantage in negotiating with them today. That is the fact that we have the kind of intelligence which enables us to know if they are cheating. In the 1960's we had a great debate as to whether there was a missile gap between the United States and the Soviet Union. Such a gap would be impossible today. We know what they have and, more important, they know that we know. As a matter of fact, it is quite interesting at some of the SALT Talks when we are

having discussions with the Russian military and they say to us, "Why are you telling all our civilians about these things. They are not supposed to know." That is, the civilians on the Russian Delegation are not supposed to know what the Russians have got. We have the means of checking on them and they know it. We have the means thanks to the technological genius of the American people.

We are a slow people to move, but when we move, we move quickly. I was a young Corporal in the American Army in 1941 and at that time, the Germans had overrun all of Western Europe and they were moving towards Moscow at 15 miles a day on a thousand-mile-long front. The United States Congress voted for universal military service by a majority of one vote. What message do you think that sent to the Japanese? They acted on it because five months later they attacked us and we had to go to war.

Pearl Harbor, in the investigation that followed, showed that squirrelled away in various parts of the U.S. Government was enough information to tell us that something like this was quite likely to happen. But everybody was sitting jealously on his own little piece of information and there was no central place where all of that information could be brought together and that resulted in 1947, after the investigation of Pearl Harbor, in the creation of the Central Intelligence Agency.

There is a widespread misunderstanding of how intelligence operates in the United States. That is one of the things I would like to talk to you about. Intelligence operates in many ways. We have what we call the Intelligence Community which is made up of the three armed services intelligence organizations, of the Defense Intelligence Agency, of the National Security Agency, of the FBI, the Central Intelligence Agency, the State Department, the Treasury Department, the Atomic Energy people and the Justice Department through the FBI. There is a widespread delusion that everybody is sitting on his own private little piece of information jealously preventing everybody else from looking at it. That isn't the way it happens. We are all working from the same data. When an intelligence telegram comes into CIA, it doesn't go just to CIA. It goes to Defense Intelligence and to whichever of the Armed Services is interested in it. We have disagreements among our analysts and we have disagreements among our services. We produce estimates or studies. They may be produced in Defense or they may be produced in CIA. But essentially all parties who have an interest in them in the Intelligence Community cooperate in this study. You don't always get everybody to agree and I'm glad that you don't, but you have different points of view. For instance, you will get a study that will go forward and you will see in the study: "CIA and Army agree with this. The Navy and the Air

Force disagree and think something else." So the policy makers who must develop our foreign policy and make the decisions which govern our country's conduct are aware of the fact that there is not universal agreement within the Intelligence Community on this. They are aware of who disagrees and they are aware of the reasons why they disagree.

The other thing I want to stress particularly is that the people who work in intelligence, whether it be in the services or in CIA, are not part of the policy making of the United States. We simply provide intelligence. The policy makers will then say to us: "What are the possible options we can follow and what would be the consequences of each one?" We will then make a study and say: "If you do option one, this will happen. If you do option two, that will happen. If you do option three, this will happen. If you do option four, that will happen." But we do not say, nor are we asked, which one of those options the United States ought to adopt. I had this brought home to me very clearly one day. I was down at the White House, while the Director was away, at a meeting presided over by Dr. Kissinger, and after I had reviewed the various options and the possible consequences of each one, he then went around the table to State, Defense, Treasury and everybody asking them which one of the options they thought we should adopt. State said one, Treasury said two, Defense said four and I said three. He said, "You don't have any vote" and went on around the table. So the idea that the

CIA or anybody in the Intelligence Community is a sort of state within a state supporting its own little private friends and having policies that are different from the policies of the United States Government is nonsense.

Yes, we have had kooks who have done wrong things or have used bad judgment. I cannot tell you we haven't. After all, 76,000 people have gone through the CIA since it was founded and if you get any group that large, you're going to have some nuts, you are going to have some odd people, and you are going to have some people show bad judgment.

You have all heard loose talk about criminal action and horrible things that were done. What are the facts? The facts are that after all this evidence had been analyzed, not one single person in CIA has been condemned for any crime or found guilty of any crime by any court in the United States. Not enough evidence has been marshalled to cause any grand jury anywhere in the United States to indict anybody in CIA for doing anything wrong. But if you read the newspapers and you listen to television, you have the impression that monstrous crimes have been committed against the American people on a gigantic scale.

I talked a little about this last night and I don't want to repeat it, but it is important that you have the ammunition and you know what the facts are. You had an impression conveyed to the American people

that there was widespread wiretapping of the American public and everybody's conversations were being listened to, that the mail was being opened indiscriminately. Let me just give you a few facts concerning that. The Director of Central Intelligence is the only person in the United States who by law is charged with the protection of his sources and methods. That means he must watch over the security of the intelligence that comes to him and how it is handled. Actually, you could loosely interpret that to do almost anything as far as our own people are concerned. And, in fact, the break-ins you heard of were break-ins only of CIA people who were suspected of taking documents home with them. Okay, we shouldn't have done it if you have one interpretation of the law. But if you take strictly the interpretation of the charge of the Director to make sure that his sources are protected, you have at least an explanation of why it was done.

On the telephone taps, the impression was given that "big brother" was listening to everything. The CIA is alleged to have conducted 32 telephone taps in 27 years. That is a little more than one per year. I'm not telling you that all of these were justified. What I am telling you is that the perspective has been distorted beyond recognition -- the ear of "big brother" listening to everything.

The mail intercept. We are carrying on as though the mail has never been opened. Anybody here who is old enough to have been in World War II knows that he used to read his men's mail officially -- they knew it, he knew it and everybody knew it -- presumably to prevent enemies of the United States from acquiring valuable information. But all of a sudden it is converted into a monstrous crime. The Congress has told us they don't want us to do it and we won't do it, but whose mail was being opened? The only mail being opened by the CIA and the FBI was mail going to or from the Soviet Union or Communist China. The idea was conveyed that mail going from Fort Lauderdale to Omaha or San Francisco to Boston was being opened. It was not being opened. The only letters that were opened were letters which (a) had already been opened by the place where they came from or (b) were going to be opened when they got to where they were going. This was presented as a great threat to the freedom of the American people.

An enormous effort, a malicious, wicked effort, has been made to convince the American people that the real threat to our freedom comes from the CIA and the FBI or the other members of the Intelligence Community. The CIA has never had the power to arrest anybody. How can you run a gestapo if you can't arrest anybody? As I said, I cannot tell you that there have not been things done which

should not have been done. But of course, the perception of the American people changes in what they want done according to the degree of threat they feel. After all, during our Civil War when President Lincoln found out that the Maryland State Assembly was about to vote Maryland out of the Union, he sent Federal troops over and closed down the Maryland State Assembly. To my knowledge there is nothing in the Constitution of the United States that authorizes the President of the United States to use Federal troops to close down the assembly of a state. This was done. Regrettably, he had to use artillery on the Copperheads in New York and a very large number of people were killed.

If we attempt to judge the past in the light of the present, we are always going to get a distorted picture. What would we think of our Founding Fathers who owned slaves, who didn't give universal suffrage? If we judge them by our standards, this was monstrous. Most of the things that you hear reproached in the Intelligence Community are things that were done in the '50s or at the latest in the early '60s. The perception of the world was different. The perception of urgency was different in those days. We face a different time now where, oddly enough, we seem to feel that there is less of a threat at a time when the threat is far greater. In the '50s and '60s the Soviet Union simply did not have the capability of really doing us harm. They do now and

for some odd reason our people do not feel as threatened today in general as they did 15 years ago. Fifteen years ago at the time of the Cuban missile crisis Florida may have been in danger but the rest of the United States was not. Today all of the United States is within the range of Russian weapons, either from the Soviet Union or from their submarines. Today a large part of the United States can be reached by Russian aircraft. On one-way missions nearly all of it could be reached by Soviet aircraft. We have to live with the times as we go along. We have just been given a list of restrictions handed down by the President and we fully intend to observe those restrictions.

People have asked me what my position is on assassination. First of all, remember, after all this loose assassination talk, the ultimate finding was that nobody was ever assassinated. My own position is that assassination is wrong. It is against the law of God. It is against the law of man, and it doesn't work. You simply get another fanatic even more fanatic than the first one, in the light of what has happened.

It is difficult in a democratic society to run an intelligence agency. We are the only democratic people I know who try to run ours in the full light of day. We may be able to do it. After all, we're the only people who have gone to the moon. If we are successful in running it in that way, we should be very much aware of the fact that we will be the only people in history who ever have. Other democratic

countries have intelligence services but they do not conduct a public striptease of them. They do not empty the pockets of their intelligence service before the general public. They have found means of correcting abuses discreetly, quietly and efficiently. You cannot have large numbers of people without some forms of abuse.

'The other day a Congressman said to me, "How can you stop the abuses in intelligence?" I said, "I know of only one way. Stop using human beings." If you have large numbers of human beings, and every one of you who has ever had a unit under him knows, there are some eightballs and some bad apples. You try to restrict them. You try to keep them under control. You punish them if they do something wrong. But if anybody tells you, "I have a recipe for stopping all of this forever," he is simply not telling you the truth. This would be a very interesting theory if we did not face the kind of a world that we face today.

We face two of the greatest powers in the world, both of whom swore in greater or lesser measure to destroy the kind of a world in which we believe. It is a fortunate circumstance for the time being that they are kind of mad at one another. But that comes and that goes. They were close friends a little while ago. Who knows what will happen when Mao dies. After all, they do share a common ideology. There is a deep feeling between them that I think we should recognize. Each one of them is trying to use us in its ploy with the

other. The Chinese have an old saying: "Against the near barbarians you must use the far barbarians." That translates simply. Against the Soviets you try to line up the Americans. The Russians, of course, are very concerned about the Chinese because the Russians have fought all their wars against people they generally outnumber four to one, and the idea of fighting somebody who will outnumber them by four to one looks to them to be sixteen times as bad as the war against the Germans and that was about as close a run thing as they want to be involved in. So they do have this concern with the Chinese.

The Chinese in the meantime are looking at the two powers that they feel threaten them, namely, the Soviet Union and us, and are making very considerable efforts in the same general direction. All of us in the Intelligence Community owe the American people a number of answers. We owe them answers as to the best estimate we can give them of who will be in control of the Soviet Union five years from today and what will their dispositions be toward us and toward our allies? What is there in Soviet research and development today that will have an impact on our lives tomorrow? And the same questions for China.

One of the difficult things about intelligence is that it is very hard to quantify in the fashionable cost-effectiveness mood which pervades our country today. Before World War II the Germans put a jeweler

in Scapa Flow which was the home base of the British Home Fleet. He posed as a Swiss jeweler. In 1937, '38, and '39 he did nothing. One night in 1941 he told his German superiors that there were no nets around the anchorages of the battleships and a German submarine went in and sank a battleship and an aircraft carrier and amortized that intelligence project five thousand times over. Had the Germans had an efficiency cost effectiveness team going around, they would have said, "In '38, '39, '40, this guy has produced nothing, pull him out!"

We have this all over the world, this difficulty of explaining intelligence to people because you cannot trumpet your successes. If you trumpet your successes, they are not successes anymore. If somebody knows that someone is looking in through that window, they will either pull the curtains or turn the lights out. So it's almost impossible. People keep saying, "Why don't you have a program like the FBI and point out the successes you have had?" The successes we've had are by methods we are still using and if we describe these, they will either find some method of countering them or they will change their method of operation so that we will no longer be able to keep track of them. President Kennedy told us, "You are doomed to be pilloried for your failures and to have your successes passed over in silence."

It takes a very special kind of people to work in intelligence. Anybody who chooses the armed forces as a career has got to be someone who is not really thinking of material advantage, and anyone who chooses intelligence as a career must not expect to have any public satisfaction. The satisfactions you have are in your heart when you know what you have done and you have achieved something tremendous and, believe me, I cannot go into the detail but we have achieved some fantastic things -- as great as going to the moon -- in the field of intelligence. But if I were to tell you about them, their effectiveness would stop tomorrow morning. We are condemned to live in this kind of an atmosphere.

I am not an old CIA man. I came there four years ago. But I want to tell you these are fantastic people. Under a bombardment which has no parallel in American history, they have continued to produce superb intelligence. They are Americans just like everybody else in this room. They live by the same standards of right and wrong. They have no means of defending themselves against the attacks. They have no means of making their voices heard to repel these false charges, to repel these false accusations. If they do, it simply is not printed. I went down to the National Press Club in Washington where I spoke for 45 minutes to the Society of Professional Journalists. I answered questions for an hour. There was not one

word about it in either of the Washington newspapers the next morning.

We simply have to go forward and do what we know must be done if our country and freedom are to survive. We have to go forward together with our allies who make a tremendous contribution to the total fund of our knowledge, who have skills and abilities and access in areas that we do not and whose collaboration is essential.

One of the great jobs I have had in the last years since this thing started has been to go around and see our friends all over the world and assure them that we were not going to destroy our intelligence capability and that we were not going to give away the secrets that they had entrusted to us and which were fundamentally not American secrets. They belonged to other powers. And we have kept to that. We have never betrayed them and they have stood steadfastly by our side. In many areas where we have been prevented from doing something, they have stepped in and done it because they know from past experience -- the continental Europeans who have been occupied, the British who lived on that island surrounded from Norway to the Spanish border by enemies -- what is at stake. We are a young people. We are at the beginning of our career and we have achieved great things, but we live in a world that as a people we have not known before. The world is no longer far away. The world is on top of us. You cannot run away from history because history follows you.

In the period immediately preceding World War II we were saying to the British and French, "Why don't you stop Hitler?" But they thought it could be weathered through and they were led to a great war that resulted in 25 million lives lost. It is always the bystanders that want someone else to do something. We are criticized by many people all over the world. I think we just have to learn that it is perhaps in the world more important to be respected than to be loved. We Americans have a passion to be loved by everybody. It would be far better for us if we were respected and perhaps not loved as much. Because we are not going to be loved. The rich and the powerful are not loved. Our British colleagues who have lived through a long period of this know this. When a nation is rich and powerful, its enemies are everywhere. The jealous and the envious are everywhere seeking to bring it down in some way. The most important thing is to be respected. If you are respected, people will not deal lightly with you. I must say, I suppose, I am an old reactionary, but I have a great deal of good to say for Lord Palmerston who, when anybody trampled on his people, had a ship off the coast and they were not trampled on much thereafter. The only real setback was Bolivia. The Bolivians killed a British Consul and Queen Victoria demanded that a warship be sent to punish the Bolivians. She was then informed that Bolivia had no seacoast and was therefore not punishable.

We face another problem. In addition to those I have mentioned, we face the problem of international terrorism which is organized today like a conspiracy all over the world. We see these insane blind actions like the murder of our Ambassador in Khartoum, the murder of our Ambassador in Beirut. We see these bombs being set off that are obviously going to hit only innocent people in an attempt to create an atmosphere of terror that will pressure the law abiding into giving in.

In this most technical of developed age we live in an atmosphere of lawlessness which has no parallel since the dark ages. It is a blind, mindless sort of thing. It is simply to create a state of fear so great that the forces of law and order will supinely lie down or give in. This international terrorism is not tightly connected but it is loosely in touch with one another. We have Venezuelans killing people in France and other people killing other people elsewhere. There is some sort of loose organization between all this and the idea is to cow the free nations of the world.

It is an odd thing that most of the New Leftists claim to be as much against the Soviet Union as they are against the United States. They have killed American Ambassadors; they have bombed American installations; they have done all sorts of things to us, but they have never done them to the Soviet Union. They only talk against them,

but they take action against the free nations. They highjack the aircraft of the free nations. Who has ever heard of a Soviet airplane being highjacked outside the Soviet Union. Yet, how many airplanes of other nations have been highjacked? There is an old saying that if it has a mane like a lion, paws like a lion, roars like a lion, there is a fair chance that it may be a lion. If this action is always taken against the free world and never against the other side, one cannot help but wonder. After all, who benefits by it? Who benefits by the destruction of the ideas of family, country, flag and religion in the Western nations? Who benefits if we in the West lose our resolution and resolve? You can't help but wonder.

So we have a very tough proposition and in this you in the Navy League have a tremendous task to perform to keep alive the flame of patriotism, the understanding of the American people that we must have the forces to protect this society which with all its shortcomings and all its defects has still given a larger number of our people more of the good things of life than any other society man has been able to devise. And so we have this task before us, all of us who live in the 20 percent of mankind who enjoy freedom, of keeping that torch burning brightly. There is no alternative. If we drop it, no one will pick it up. And who knows how long the night will last. Thank you very much.